## **EXHIBIT F**

GRAPHICS PROPERTIES HOLDINGS, INC.,  Plaintiff,  V.  ASUS COMPUTER INTERNATIONAL, INC., ASUS TECHNOLOGY PTE LTD., and ASUSTEK COMPUTER INC.,  Defendants.  GRAPHICS PROPERTIES HOLDINGS, INC., A Delaware Corporation, Plaintiff,  V.  GOOGLE, INC., A Delaware Corporation, Defendant.  GRAPHICS PROPERTIES HOLDINGS, INC., A Delaware Corporation, Defendant.  GRAPHICS PROPERTIES HOLDINGS, INC., A Delaware Corporation, Defendant.  GRAPHICS PROPERTIES HOLDINGS, INC., A Delaware Corporation, No. 12-1394-LPS  Civil Action No. 12-1395-LPS  V.  HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY, A Delaware Corporation,	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE	
<pre>INC., ASUS TECHNOLOGY PTE LTD.,) and ASUSTEK COMPUTER INC.,     Defendants.  GRAPHICS PROPERTIES</pre>	HOLDINGS, INC., Plaintiff,	5.
HOLDINGS, INC., A Delaware Corporation,  Plaintiff,  No. 12-1394-LPS  V.  GOOGLE, INC., A Delaware Corporation,  Defendant.  GRAPHICS PROPERTIES HOLDINGS, INC., A Delaware Corporation,  Plaintiff,  Plaintiff,  No. 12-1395-LPS  V.  HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY,	INC., ASUS TECHNOLOGY PTE LTD., and ASUSTEK COMPUTER INC.,	) ) ) )
V.  GOOGLE, INC., A Delaware Corporation, Defendant.  GRAPHICS PROPERTIES HOLDINGS, INC., A Delaware Corporation, Plaintiff, Plaintiff, Plaintiff, No. 12-1395-LPS  V.  HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY,	HOLDINGS, INC.,	) ) ) )
A Delaware Corporation,  Defendant.  GRAPHICS PROPERTIES HOLDINGS, INC., A Delaware Corporation,  Plaintiff,  Plaintiff,  No. 12-1395-LPS  V.  HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY,		•
GRAPHICS PROPERTIES HOLDINGS, INC., A Delaware Corporation,  Plaintiff,  Plaintiff,  No. 12-1395-LPS  V.  HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY,		) ) )
HOLDINGS, INC., A Delaware Corporation,  Plaintiff,  Olivil Action No. 12-1395-LPS  V.  HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY,	Defendant.	) )
V. No. 12-1395-LPS  HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY,	HOLDINGS, INC.,	) ) )
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY, )	Plaintiff,	5
	V *	)
y .		) )
Defendant.	Defendant.	

```
GRAPHICS PROPERTIES
HOLDINGS, INC.,
   A Delaware Corporation,
                              ) Civil Action
  Plaintiff,
                                No. 12-1397-LPS
V.
LENOVO GROUP LTD.,
   A Chinese Company,
LENOVO HOLDING COMPANY, INC.,
   A Delaware Company,
LENOVO (UNITED STATES) INC.,
   A Delaware Corporation,
   Defendants.
GRAPHICS PROPERTIES
HOLDINGS, INC.,
                              ) Civil Action
  Plaintiff,
                              ) No. 13-864-LPS
V.
ASUS COMPUTER INTERNATIONAL,
INC.,
   Defendant.
                Tuesday, July 1, 2014
                12:52 p.m.
                844 North King Street
                Wilmington, Delaware
BEFORE: The HONORABLE LEONARD P. STARK, CHIEF JUDGE
        United States District Judge
             *DISCOVERY TELECONFERENCE*
```

cases, one of which is 12-2010-LPS, and there's 1 various related cases. We're here on three 2 3 issues. I thought it would be helpful in this case for me to share my thoughts with you 4 5 initially and focus your presentations, hopefully, as a result. 6 7 So there are three issues. terms of the page limits on printing source 8 code, my inclination is to side with Google and 9 limit that to a hard limit of 500 pages, 10 provided that Google will respond reasonably to 11 12 requests for additional pages, including by 13 meeting and conferring in good faith to resolve 14 any disputes without further judicial 1.5 intervention. That seems to me like it would be 16 17 a reasonable outcome and a reasonable accomodation in balancing the need to adequately 18 protect Google's highly valuable source code, 19 while at the same time permitting plaintiff to 20 21 adequately prepare its case. So that's my 22 inclination on the printing source code issue. 23 On the acquisition bar I'm inclined to side with GPH, which means I'm 24

inclined to reject the acquisition bar, which is what I have done on some recent occasions, and it's what I understand to be the general practice in this district and other courts.

It seems to me that the risks that an acquisition bar is seeking to address are more attenuated than the risks involved in patent prosecution. The proposed bar here strikes me as too broad, and it seems inconsistent that defendants aren't worried about barring defense counsel in the way same they're seeking to bar plaintiff's counsel. So that's my inclination on the second issue.

The third one about export limit is where things are less clear to me. Google is proposing some pretty strict limits. It's unclear to me why any of Google's information will need to leave the country for any reason in connection with this case, but if it has to, I'm unsure whether all of Google's information really needs the full level of protection that Google is proposing.

So let's start with that third issue because that's the one where things are

```
MR. SCHECTER: Your Honor, may I
1
2
       briefly respond to that?
                    THE COURT: It's not necessary.
 3
       I'm going to adhere to my inclination and not
 4
       adopt the acquisition bar here. I'm just not
 5
       persuaded that it's warranted under the
 6
       circumstances as they present themselves here.
7
       So the protective order that you present to me
 8
       should not contain the acquisition bar.
 9
10
                     I do want to get a cleaned up,
        agreed upon version of the protective order. I
11
        know there's a holiday this week.
12
                     Mr. Valentine, when would it be
13
        reasonable for me to have you submit that to us?
14
                    MR. VALENTINE: Could we have,
15
       perhaps, one week from today?
16
                    THE COURT: Mr. Schecter, is that
17
18
        agreeable to you?
                    MR. SCHECTER: That's fine, Your
19
        Honor. I don't see any reason why we couldn't
20
        turn this around to you more quickly than that.
21
        I don't know why we couldn't get it to you by
22
23
        close of business tomorrow.
                    THE COURT: Mr. Valentine?
24
```